

Remarks

In view of the following amendments and remarks, favorable reconsideration of the outstanding office action is respectfully requested. Claims 1 – 25 remain in this application. Claims 13 and 14 have been amended.

1. Oath/Declaration

The Examiner asserts that the declaration originally filed in the application is defective because non-initialed and/or non-dated alterations have been made to the declaration. In response, the applicants have provided a new declaration attached hereto.

2. Drawings

A. The Examiner objects to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a). The Examiner asserts that every feature of the claimed invention is not shown in the drawings. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the line terminals, the receptacle contacts, the feed-through terminals, and the fault detector are not shown in the drawings. However, the applicants respectfully point out that each of these features are explicitly shown, for example, in Figure 5. Figure 5 labels the line terminals as “LINE(HOT)” AND “LINE (NEUT)”. The receptacle terminals are labeled as “RECEPT. (HOT)” AND “RECEPT. (NEUT)”. The feed-through terminals are labeled as “LOAD (HOT)” AND “LOAD (NEUT)”. Those of ordinary skill will understand that feed-through terminal and load terminal are synonymous terms. A careful reading of the specification reveals that the fault detector is included in the circuitry shown in Figure 5.

B. The Examiner also objects to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(4) because reference character “46” and reference character “48” are used twice in the specification. In particular, the last two lines of the specification refer to rotor 48 and cam 46. In response, the applicants have amended this portion of the specification to read “...causing rotor 46 to rotate cam 44...”

3. Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 13 – 14 because GFCI is not spelled out in claim 13 and AFCI is not spelled out in claim 14. The applicants respectfully point out that the term GFCI is well known within the art. For example, entry of the term “GFCI” in the USPTO database yields approximately 440 hits. The same can be said for the term AFCI, which yielded almost 100 hits. Nevertheless, the applicants have amended claim 13 and claim 14 to spell out the term GFCI and AFCI, respectively.

4. Allowed Claims/Subject Matter

Applicant notes with appreciation that the Examiner has indicated the subject matter of claims 1 – 25 is patentable, and would be allowable if the objections set forth in the Office Action are overcome. Applicants respectfully assert that the objections set forth in the outstanding Office Action have been addressed.

5. Conclusion

Based upon the amendments, remarks, and papers of record, Applicant believes the pending claims of the above-captioned application are in allowable form and patentable over the prior art of record. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims 1 – 25 and a prompt Notice of Allowance thereon.

Applicant believes that no extension of time is necessary to make this Response timely. Should Applicant be in error, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office grant such time extension pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) as necessary to make this Response timely, and hereby authorizes the Office to charge any necessary fee or surcharge with respect to said time extension to the deposit account of the undersigned firm of attorneys, Deposit Account 50-1546.

Please direct any questions or comments to Daniel P. Malley at (607) 330-4010.

Respectfully submitted,

BOND, SCHOENECK & KING, PLLC



Daniel P. Malley

Registration No. 43,443

BOND, SCHOENECK & KING, PLLC

10 Brown Rd.

Suite 201

Ithaca, NY 14850-1248

Date: 6-8-2005